

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 312 670

CS 212 164

AUTHOR Malek, Abbas
TITLE "New York Times" Editorial Position and the U.S. Foreign Policy: The Case of Iran.
PUB DATE May 89
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (39th, San Francisco, CA, May 25-29, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; Content Analysis; Editorials; Federal Government; Foreign Countries; *Foreign Policy; Media Research; *Newspapers; *Press Opinion
IDENTIFIERS Iran; Iran Hostage Crisis; Journalism Research; *Media Government Relationship; *New York Times

ABSTRACT

A study examined the similarity or dissimilarity between the "New York Times'" editorial position on Iran and Iranian affairs and the official United States foreign policy towards Iran as reflected in the "Department of State Bulletin" for the period of 1968-1981. Each piece was categorized by major category and sub-category by three coders who provided a general evaluation and an evaluation using the scale "favorable," "unfavorable," or "neutral." Results indicated that: (1) a similarity existed between the newspaper's editorial position and government policy towards Iran's internal and foreign relations, particularly as they related to the United States; (2) while the United States government pursued a conciliatory attitude but low profile during the Iranian Revolution, the "Times" shifted to a more critical position towards Iran; and (3) there was a great affinity between the newspaper's editorial position and that of the United States government during the hostage crisis. (Eleven tables of data are attached.) (RS)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED312670

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Abbas Malek

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

New York Times' editorial position and the US foreign policy:

The case of Iran¹

by Abbas Malek

School of Communications
Howard University
Washington, DC 20059, USA

¹This article is based on the author's doctoral dissertation, "The New York Times, U.S. Foreign Policy and the Iranian Revolution," The American University, Washington, DC, 1984.

Studies dealing with the subject of the press and foreign policy generally have two main characteristics: (1) they study the treatment of foreign policy issues by a number of newspapers through the examination of "news" coverage; (2) they conversely also attempt to examine the foreign policy process of the government by analyzing the statements of the decisionmakers in the press on specific issues, which by nature are selective statements. Therefore, these studies in the first instance tend to analyze foreign policy coverage of the press in isolation; and in the second case they analyze foreign policy as it is perceived by the press, rather than as the actual policy is articulated in official documents. As a result the interplay between the foreign policy positions of the major elite newspapers and official government policy has remained unexplored.²

In American polity, it is generally recognized that the press performs a variety of functions, one being its active role in the foreign policy process. The press is a main channel through which foreign policy decisionmakers explain their actions to rally public support for government positions. It is also a dominant means by which non-government opinion makers, interest groups, and the mass public convey their opinions to government leaders.

However, there are only a few newspapers that enjoy an influential status in American society, based on their coverage of foreign affairs, the position they may take on foreign policy issues, and the authoritative status in American society, based on their coverage of foreign affairs, the position they may take on foreign policy issues,

²The author wishes to thank Professor Hamid Mowlana and Dr. Florence Setzer for their review and critical comments.

and the authoritative status that they occupy among the "elites." These are the "elite" or the "prestigious" press.¹

There is a universal consensus that the *New York Times* is one of the most influential elite papers in the United States. The influence of the *Times* on U.S. national politics and its large readership among official decisionmakers and influential elites in the area of foreign policy have been well documented.

The most apparent way in which the press enter the policy maker's world is by means of the daily newspapers. And the single most important newspaper is, of course, the *New York Times*. It is read by virtually everyone in the government who has an interest or responsibility in foreign affairs. ... The *Times* is uniformly regarded as the authoritative paper in the foreign policy field. In the words of a State Department official in public affairs field, "you can't work in the State Department without the *New York Times*."²

The purpose of this study is to examine the similarity or dissimilarity between the *Times*' editorial position on Iran and Iranian affairs and the official U.S. foreign policy towards Iran for the period of 1968-1981.³ The study concentrates on the editorial section -- not the news coverage -- of the *Times* for several reasons: (1) it is the core of the paper's opinion; (2) its contents manifest the paper's stand on the issues of the day; and (3) the policy governing the paper, which may well be carried over to news coverage, is reflected in its editorials.⁴

The *Times*' opinion/position, as reflected in its editorial page, is usually considered one of the important sources of public opinion by the foreign policy decisionmaking circle. And, as one of the *Times* chief editors once said: "...nobody

should be left in doubt as to where the *Times* stands on any major subject. ..." He implied that it is not only the opportunity, but the duty of the editorial page to enter and clarify the paper's position on any significant public issue.⁵

Although it is almost impossible to directly investigate the possible impact or influence of the editorial positions taken by the *Times* on foreign policy decisionmaking processes, it can be argued that in the United States the *Times'* stand and its opinion on major issues cannot be ignored by officials. It is not, however, suggested here that there is a determinate causal relationship between the position the *Times* takes on an issue and the outcome of U.S. policy on that issue. What is argued here is that when it comes to a major foreign policy issue which has broad implications, officials would seriously consider the opinion of the elite press in general, and the *Times* in particular. Therefore, it was decided to investigate the *Times'* editorial position on Iran and Iranian affairs and compare it with US foreign policy towards Iran as it is reflected in the *Department of State Bulletin*.

In short, this study attempts to: (1) analyze the content of the *Times'* editorials about Iran for three specific time periods: 1968-1978 (the decade prior to the Iranian revolution); 1978-1979 (revolutionary period; and 1979-1981 (the hostage crisis); (2) to assess American policy towards Iran during the same time periods through the examination of the official documents as reflected in the *Department of State Bulletin*, "the official record of U.S. foreign policy;"⁶ and (3) to investigate the similarity or dissimilarity between the two sources for the time period under investigation.

To examine such a possible similarity or dissimilarity a number of propositions advanced in earlier studies can be adopted for the purpose of this study.⁷

Propositions

1. During the decade prior to the Iranian revolution, the coverage of Iranian affairs by the American press was sporadic, but consistently supportive of the royal regime in Iran. The coverage of Iran by the American Press focused on a very narrow segment of a complicated society, that of the ruling political and economic elites.
2. Portraying Iran as a country impatiently and eagerly pursuing a path of "modernization" and economic development, the American press presented an image of Iran consistent with one that already existed in the American foreign policy establishment.
3. For more than a decade, from the late 1960s to the late 1970s, the U.S. government and the U.S. press were, to some extent, in agreement about Iran's political, economic and social stability. They shared the perception that Iran was socially and politically stable and militarily capable of securing peace in the Persian Gulf area, which is of vital concern to the Western world.
4. Beginning in 1978 and continuing up to the Iranian revolution, events in Iran, particularly issues such as human rights and military spending in general, and economic and social unrest in particular, created certain conditions as a result of which the American press began to see Iranian affairs differently. The press began to actively question the degree of American involvement in Iran and to cast doubt on the stability of the royal regime. Both these issues were absent in publicized U.S. policy toward Iran.
5. The shift of the American press from nearly total support of the Shah's regime to a more critical review of his policies to some degree seemed to help the

voices of Iranian dissidents to be heard by outsiders; that in turn might be considered a contributing factor in the creation of an environment in which the U.S. government would re-evaluate its own policy toward Iran.

6. The seizure of the American embassy in Tehran seemed to create an environment in which the press once again moved toward the position taken by the US government on Iran. The incident caused a shift in the position of the press from being critical of American foreign policy to essentially adopting the government's position condemning Iran.

Methodology and research design

In this study, the intention was to employ content analysis as a method of studying the messages of two different sources, the *New York Times*' editorials and the *Department of State Bulletin*. The analysis concentrates on the content of these sources without reference to either the intentions of the source or the effect of the messages upon those to whom they are directed. Therefore, the research design is centered around one part of the whole process of communication, the manifest content of the message.

Here, we were interested in examining and comparing the content of the *Times* editorials and that of the *Department of State Bulletin*, for three different but consecutive time periods. To simplify the major goals of this study:

X1	_____	X2	_____	X3
T1	_____	T2	_____	T3
S1 ***** S2 ***** S3				
Y1	_____	Y2	_____	Y3
T1	_____	T2	_____	T3
Z1 ***** Z2 ***** Z3				

X = the *New York Times*.

T = The time periods - T1 = the first period, 1968-1978; T2 = the second period, 1978-1979; and T3 = the third period, 1979-1981.

S = the trend of the *Times* editorial position - S1 = the trend of the first period, S2 = the trend of the second period, and S3 = the trend of the third period.

Y = the *Department of Statement Bulletin*.

Z = U.S. policy towards Iran as documented in the *Bulletin* - Z1 = U.S. policy for the first period; Z2 = U.S. policy for the second period; and Z3 = U.S. policy for the third period.

Therefore, the propositions, stated above, for the purpose of this article can be summarized in three hypotheses:

- *Hypothesis 1*: S1 = Z1 (There was no significant difference between the *Times*' editorial position and US foreign policy on Iran for a period of ten years prior to the Iranian Revolution - 1968-1978).
- *Hypothesis 2*: S2 ≠ Z2 (The Iranian revolution - 1978-1979 - forced the *Times* to reevaluate its position on Iran, as a result of which disagreement on policy toward Iran emerged between the paper and the US government).

- *Hypothesis 3: S3 = Z3* (The act of hostage taking by the Iranians once again aligned the *Times* and the US government in their policy towards Iran in the period of 1979-1981).

The data base

The universe of data in this study was: (1) all the *Times* editorials in which, directly or indirectly, Iran was the subject of discussion between November 1968, the beginning of a new relationship between the US and Iran and January 20, 1981, the day that hostages were released by the Iranians; and (2) all policy documents related to Iran as they were published in the *Bulletin* for the period 1968-1981.

Coding

From the preliminary review of the *Times* and the *Bulletin*, several categories were identified, e.g., The Shah, The Economy, Military, Oil, US-Iran relations, etc., most of which were common in both sources for each period. Each category consisted of several sub-categories. The number of sub-categories was different from one source to another.

Each piece was coded by three coders. All three coders had to agree on the major categories and sub-categories in order for these issues to be included in analysis and evaluation.⁸

Evaluation:

After identifying the categories and sub-categories, each coder evaluated all the identified issues and subjects for two different purposes: (1) for a general evaluation of the piece to code it as "favorable," "unfavorable," or "neutral;" and (2) for the evaluation of all subjects and issues within each category and sub-category in the piece as they fit in one of the three evaluation categories -- "favorable," "unfavorable," and "neutral."

In other words, the content of each piece was first evaluated as one entity and in the second stage each identified issue/subject was evaluated as an independent item.⁹

Findings

Iran was virtually ignored by the *Times* between 1968 and 1978. As Table 1 shows, there was, on the average, less than half an editorial per year dealing with Iran and Iranian affairs in the paper.

Table 2 demonstrates the subjects covered by the *Times* between 1968 and 1978. As Table 1 shows, there was, on the average, less than half an editorial per year dealing with Iran and Iranian affairs in the paper.

Table 2 demonstrates the subjects covered by the *Times* editorials on Iran between 1968 and 1978 and the evaluations assigned to them. The center of editorial attention and the theme most frequently mentioned was the Shah and issues related to him. Almost every piece appearing in the paper somehow praised the Shah for his dedication to modernizing a backward nation.

Moreover, even in the approximately 24 percent of the editorials related to the Shah which were identified as "unfavorable," the *Times* never once criticized the Shah and his policies. Most of the "unfavorable" statements in the paper dealt with the possibility of U.S. forces getting involved as a result of American support and arms in an "unwanted crisis" that the Shah might create. The Shah's internal policies and Iran's domestic political atmosphere were not major issues of concern for the *Times*.¹⁰

For example, as late as November 1977, after a major demonstration organized by Iranian students during a formal welcoming ceremony for the Shah by President Carter in front of the White House, the *Times* published an editorial in which the Shah was clearly praised for his policies regarding human rights. The paper wrote: "There

has been some progress on human rights in Iran in recent months. Persons must be arraigned or released within 24 hours after arrest. Trials include more safeguards for the accused. Prison conditions are better. Some political prisoners have been released."¹¹

In short, for a duration of ten years there were several editorials by the *Times* in which the dominant theme was the Shah. The general trend of the paper's attitude was "favorable" towards the monarch.

Examination of the *Department of State Bulletin* during the same period showed that the United States' foreign policy towards Iran was not much different from the positions taken by the *Times*. During the Nixon Administration, Iran emerged from its traditional peripheral position as the "key pillar" of the U.S. "Two-pillar" policy. And, the Shah became the best and most eligible candidate to implement the "Nixon Doctrine." As a result, "special relations" between the two countries were developed, and that relationship continued throughout the Ford and Carter administrations.

Our investigation of U.S. policy towards Iran revealed the fact that although there were times during which U.S.-Iran relations were not as "rosy" as then Secretary of State Henry Kissinger described throughout the Nixon and the Ford administrations,¹² the policies were uniformly evaluated as "favorable" toward Iran. That is, as shown in Table 3, we did not identify any serious "unfavorable" stated and documented U.S. policy in the *Bulletin* toward Iran throughout the decade prior to the Iranian revolution.

When the general trend of the U.S. government attitude in regard to Iran was compared with that of the *Times*, no statistically significant difference between the two was observed. ($\chi^2 = 9.05$, d.f. = 4, $p > .05$) Generally, as Table 4 shows, the *Times*

and the State Department displayed a very similar supportive -- and "favorable" -- attitude toward Iran in general, and the Shah in particular.

The *Times*' attention to Iran increased as a result of the social unrest of 1978-1979 in that country. The paper published on average 24 times as many editorials on Iran per year during this period than it had in the previous decade (Table 1).

During the revolutionary period, 1978-1979, however, some degree of dissimilarity emerged between the *Times* and the *Bulletin*. The *Times* began, for the first time, to re-examine its long-standing "favorable" position on Iran. In the early stages of the Iranian revolution, the paper not only became critical of the royal regime, whose partial had previously been "favorable," but even began to question U.S. policy towards Iran. For the first time, two new patterns in the *Times* approach to Iran were observed: (1) criticism of the royal regime in Iran; (2) and to some extent, critical evaluation of past U.S. policy towards Iran. Interestingly, as can be seen in Table 5, on the one hand this change in attitude toward Iran during the revolution included not only, to some degree, an "unfavorable" analysis of Iranian affairs of the past in general (especially of the royal regime), but also some "neutral" (5.6%) and at times even "favorable" (9.0%) treatment of the new revolutionary trends in Iran by the paper. On the other hand, for the first time, all the "unfavorable" statements about the Shah were related to the regime's domestic policies.

Although a revolution was taking place in Iran, US policy, for whatever reason, did not change. The United States policy was to support the Shah's regime, and, as Table 6 shows, throughout the revolutionary period the policy remained unchanged. It took a serious setback in Iran before the US government would accept the revolutionary government Iran.

In regard to U.S. policy and its relationship to the *Times* and the *Bulletin* during the second period, 1978-1979, as shown in Table 7. That is, there was a statistically significant difference between the *Times*' "foreign policy" and the official U.S. policy toward Iran during the Iranian revolution. ($\chi^2 = 11.08$, d.f. = 2, $p > .05$)

However, although during the period 1978-1979 there was a general dissimilarity between the two, toward the end of the period the *Times*' editorials appeared less "favorable" toward Iran and Iranian affairs than in the early stages of the revolution. In the latter part of the second period, we found a sharp decline in "favorable" and "neutral" comments in the paper about Iran and Iranian affairs. And, as time progressed, we witnessed signs of more disappointment in the tone of the paper's editorials.

During the same period, 1978-1979, a very slow transformation of U.S. government attitudes in the direction of the *Times*' position, from "favorable" to "neutral" and "unfavorable," was observed. In the early part of the Iranian revolution the U.S. employed a very low-profile but conciliatory approach toward Iran. Although the revolutionary Iran did not have a very positive attitude toward the U.S. at the time, the U.S. government did not change its conciliatory approach, hoping for an improvement in the two countries' relations.

The takeover of the American embassy in Tehran by Iranian students, and the hostage taking, however, brought about a considerable change in the position of the *Times* and US policy towards Iran as reflected in the *Bulletin*. The *Times* significantly increased its attention to Iran. As Table 1 demonstrates, the frequency of editorials on Iran was in average almost 55 times as great between November 4, 1979 -- the day

that the American Embassy was taken over by Iranian students -- and January 20, 1981 -- the day that hostages were released -- as during the first period.

The editorials differed qualitatively as well. There was a great difference in the *Times'* editorial position on Iran between the second period and the third period. As Table 8 shows, during the third period the *Times* did not retain much of its "favorable" stand on Iran and Iranian revolutionary government. Instead, the paper took a very hard-line position, which was not very different from the official US policy towards Iran.

Table 9 shows the *DSB'* positions toward Iran during 1979-81. Interestingly, although the US government adopted a very "unfavorable" attitude towards Iran as a result of the hostage taking, it seems the government, at least officially - probably for political reasons -- was less harsh on Iran than the paper.

As shown in Table 11, once again we witnessed a parallel between the approaches employed by the *Times* and the *Bulletin* in their treatment of Iran. There was an agreement between the paper's position and that of the US government. In this case both sources took an "unfavorable" attitude toward Iran -- one of the condemnation of the revolutionary government in Iran and the hostage-taking that remained unchanged throughout the 444 days of the hostage crisis. In other words, once again, one could observe no significant difference between the two sources ($X^2 = 4.06$, $df = 2$, $P > .05$). There was a strong agreement between the *Times* and the *Bulletin*, similar to the one we found in the first period, but different in direction -- "unfavorable".

Conclusion

From a close look at the summary of the findings, as shown in Table 11, at least three major conclusions can be drawn from the analysis in this study. First is the similarity

between the *Times* editorial position and U.S. government policy towards Iran's internal and foreign relations, particularly as they related to the United States. If Iran occupied a strategically important and "vital" position for the West, as it certainly did in the opinion of many, then a continued and critical investigation of U.S. government policies toward that country should have been one of the primary focuses of critical analysis by the writers of editorials in the *Times*. Instead, review of Iran's complex social, political, and economic development was fragmentary at best. This was particularly evident during the period between 1968 and 1978, the decade prior to the Iranian revolution.

Second is the sudden shift in the editorial position of the *Times* compared to the official U.S. foreign policy towards Iran during the Iranian revolution, 1978-1979. While the U.S. government was still pursuing the same conciliatory and somehow "favorable," but low profile, policy towards the Shah's regime, the *Times* shifted to a more critical editorial position towards Iran. At some point during the Iranian revolution of 1978-1979, the *Times* even questioned the long-standing U.S. support of the Shah's regime in Iran. In short, it took a dramatic social and political change (a revolution) in Iranian society for the *Times* editorials to begin to scrutinize seriously U.S. foreign policy towards Iran; and it was then that a significant difference surfaced between the *Times*' position and U.S. government policy on Iran.

Third was the similarity between the *Times*' editorial position and U.S. policy toward Iran during the 1979-1981 hostage crisis. There was a great affinity between the *Times*' editorial position and that of the U.S. Administration, as there had been during the ten-year period, 1968-1978, prior to the Iranian revolution. Although establishment of the *Times*' editorial position more or less preceded that of the

Administration policy on the hostage question, its view of Iran's internal condition generally remained in line with Washington's.

In short, from the findings of this study one can observe that for ten years when the Shah of Iran was perceived as a close ally and reliable friend of the United States, the *Times* editorial position followed the U.S. foreign policy stand on Iran. However, when the Shah seemed to be in trouble, the *Times* editorial position began to differ from that of the Administration. It was after that that the US Administration became seriously concerned over Iran and Iranian affairs. Later, however, when the hostages were taken, the temporary differences between the *Times*' "foreign policy" and U.S. foreign policy towards Iran once again disappeared.

If such a finding can be confirmed by other studies, then one can question the degree of the fulfillment of the responsibility set for a great newspaper by one of the founders of the *Times*; Adolf Ochs once said no reader of his newspaper should ever be surprised; a great newspaper, he implied, should analyze the economic and social forces at work in a particular country, and be so in touch with its political movements and the mood of its citizens, that readers would in a general sense be prepared for tomorrow's headlines. That definitely was not the case in Iran.

Finally, the conclusions of this study seem to be in line with some of the conclusions of other studies. In investigating the *Times*' editorial position and its news coverage of the early American engagement in Indochina, Susan Welch, for example, found that out of the four elite American newspapers studied, "the *Times* was most positively oriented toward Administration policy."¹³ Although there have been a number of studies in which the authors attempted to investigate the reason for such a phenomenon in the relationship between the American elite press and U.S. foreign

policy, and its implications, the complexity of the subject begs for more comprehensive studies. If this article has stimulated some thoughts on the issue, through a case study, it has accomplished its purpose.

1. See Bernard Cohen, *The Press and Foreign Policy*, Princeton: New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1963; James Rosenau, (eds.) *Domestic Sources of Foreign Policy*, New York: The Free Press, 1967; James Rosenau, *Public Opinion and Foreign Policy: An Operational Formulation*, New York: Random House, 1961.
2. Bernard Cohen, "Foreign Policy Makers and the Press," in James Rosenau (eds.) *International Politics and Foreign Policy*, New York: The Free Press, 1961, pp. 220-221.
3. See the author's dissertation for the reasons for the selection of the time period.
4. Ben Bagdikian, *The Effect Conspiracy*, New York: Harper and Row, 1974, pp. 146-148.
5. Frank S. Adams, "The Times' Editorial 'We'," *The Masthead*, Spring 1966, p. 20.
6. On its cover page the *Department of State Bulletin* reads: "published by the Bureau of Public Affairs, as the official record of U.S. foreign policy. Its purpose is to provide the public, the Congress, and government agencies with information on the developments in U.S. foreign relations and the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service." It should be mentioned that although the *DSB* was chosen as the source for this analysis, we were aware of the limitations that the *DSB* might endure as THE source. At the same time, since it was the purpose of this study to investigate the official U.S. foreign policy, it was decided to choose *DSB*, which was the most suitable for the purpose of this study.
7. Hamid Mowlana, "The role of the Media in the U.S.-Iranian Conflict," in Andrew Arno and Wimal Dissanayake, (eds.) *The News Media in National and International Conflict*, Boulder: Westview Press, 1984, pp. 71-97.

8. It should be mentioned that there was a 91 percent inter-coder agreement in the process of the overall evaluation. In the evaluation of the subjects and issues within each piece, however, inter-coder agreement was low in the early stages of the coding. But as a result of more training, reliability was improved to an acceptable level. For details, see the author's dissertation.
9. For a complete list of categories, sub-categories and other methodological information see the author's dissertation.
10. For example, we did not identify even one issue related to religion during the entire ten-year period prior to the revolution.
11. The *New York Times*, November 17, 1977.
12. For detail see the author's dissertation, chapter II.
13. Susan Welce, "The American Press and Indochina, 1950-56," in Richard L. Merritt (eds.) *Communication in International Politics*, 1972, p. 213.

Table 1. Distribution of editorials and documents throughout three periods NYT, DSB (1968-1981).

Time period	Frequency		Per year	
	NYT	DSB	NYT	DSB
First (1968-78)	6	36	1/2	3
Second (1978-79)	12	11	12	11
Third (1979-81)	33	46	27	38
Total	51	93		

Table 2. Subjects and subjects evaluations NYT (1968-1978).

Subject	Frequency(%)	Favorable(%)	Unfavorable(%)	Neutral(%)
The Shah	45.3	75.9	24.1	.0
Economy	32.8	95.2	4.8	.0
Military	18.8	58.3	41.7	.0
Oil	3.1	100.0	.0	.0
Total	100.0			

Table 3. Subjects and subjects evaluations DSB (1968-1978)

Subject	Frequency(%)	Favorable(%)	Unfavorable(%)	Neutral(%)
The Shah	47.8	100.0	.0	.0
Economy	24.2	100.0	.0	.0
Military	12.1	100.0	.0	.0
Oil	7.2	100.0	.0	.0
US-Iran Relations	8.7	100.0	.0	.0
Total	100.00			

Table 4. Comparative subject evaluation NYT, DSB (1968-1978).

Subject	Favorable (%)		Unfavorable (%)		Neutral (%)	
	NYT	DSB	NYT	DSB	NYT	DSB
The Shah	75.9	100.0	24.1	.0	.0	.0
Economy	95.2	100.0	4.8	.0	.0	.0
Military	58.3	100.0	41.7	0	.0	.0
Oil	100.0	100.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
US-Iran relations	.0	100.0	.0	.0	.0	.0

Table 5. Subject evaluation NYT (1978-1979).

Subject	Frequency(%)	Favorable(%)	Unfavorable(%)	Neutral(%)
Revolution	62.2	9.0	85.4	5.6
The Shah	21.0	83.3	16.7	.0
Religion	8.4	.0	100.0	.0
Oil	4.9	14.3	71.7	14.0
Economy	2.8	50.0	50.0	.0
Military	0.7	100.0	.0	.0

Table 6. Subjects and subjects evaluations DSB (1978-1979).

Subject	Frequency(%)	Favorable(%)	Unfavorable(%)	Neutral(%)
Revolution	32.3	72.2	19.4	8.4
The Shah	40.5	98.0	2.0	.0
US-Iran Relations	27.2	48.0	52.0	.0
(Oil, the economy, military)				

Table 7. Comparative subject evaluation NYT, DSB (1978-1979).

Subject	Favorable(%)		Unfavorable(%)		Neutral(%)	
	NYT	DSB	NYT	DSB	NYT	DSB
Revolution	9.0	72.0	85.4	19.4	5.6	8.4
The Shah	83.3	98.0	16.0	2.0	.0	.0
US-Iran Relations	54.6	48.0	43.4	52.0	.0	.0

Table 8. Subject and subject evaluations NYT (1979-1981).

Subject	Frequency(%)	Favorable(%)	Unfavorable(%)	Neutral(%)
Revolution	52.1	14.6	82.3	3.1
Internal politics	33.7	3.9	92.2	3.9
The Shah	14.2	55.0	45.0	.0

Table 9. Subject and subject evaluations DSB (1979-1981).

Subject	Frequency(%)	Favorable(%)	Unfavorable(%)	Neutral(%)
Revolution	24.3	22.9	67.5	9.6
Internal politics	51.3	17.1	77.8	5.1
The Shah	24.4	20.0	60.0	20.0

Table 10. Comparative subject evaluation NYT, DSB (1979-1981).

Subject	Favorable(%)		Unfavorable(%)		Neutral(%)	
	NYT	DSB	NYT	DSB	NYT	DSB
Revolution	14.6	22.9	82.3	67.5	3.1	9.6
Internal politics	3.9	17.1	92.2	77.8	3.9	5.1
The Shah	55.0	20.0	45.0	60.0	.0	20.0

Table 11. Overall evaluation for three periods NYT, DSB (1968-1981).

Evaluation	First period		Second period		Third period	
	NYT	DSB	NYT	DSB	NYT	DSB
Favorable	100.0%	100.0%	17.5%	100.0%	2.0%	6.5%
Unfavorable	.0%	.0%	62.9%	.0%	91.7%	87.4%
Neutral	.0%	.0%	19.6%	.0%	6.3%	6.1%
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0